

REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is filed in response to the Final Action of August 31, 2007 in which the Examiner Responded to Applicant's arguments and then again rejected claims 1 and 4-14 but this time on the new ground of 35 USC 103, i.e., as being obvious over *Grohoski et al* (US 2004/0225885) in view of *Aaro et al* (U.S. 6,662,020).

The Examiner was not convinced by the applicant's previous argumentation regarding the same combination of references in which it was stated that a difference in subject-matter of new independent claim 1 as compared to the disclosure of *Grohoski et al* is that the electronic device of the present invention has a secure mode and a normal mode, which modes are indicated by a configuration register 313 and which register is set by a processor 303 in the device. However, applicant has studied the Examiner's further remarks and, in light of the further remarks which follow, reconsideration is requested.

Applicant still respectfully disagrees with the Examiner and avers that *Aaro et al* do not teach that "a configuration register is arranged to indicate to ***an accelerator*** whether secure mode or normal mode ***is set by the processor***," but rather that a user operates a manual button to set a switch and thereby selects the operation mode of the device. Consequently, there are features of pending claim 1 that are neither disclosed by *Grohoski et al* nor by *Aaro et al*. Furthermore, for the reasons given below concerning the lack of any motivation to combine, it will be evident to anyone that developing the device obtainable by means of combining *Grohoski et al* and *Aaro et al* to include those features would require inventive skill that is beyond the capability of the person of ordinary skills in the art. When studying the references once again and analyzing the response from the Examiner, it is also clear that the combining of *Aaro* and *Grohoski* is an improper combination of references.

The Examiner motivates the combining of the two references by saying that a person skilled in the art would utilize *Aaros'* method of providing secure operation modes for a processor because of what is stated in *Aaro* column 1 lines 51 – 57: "In view of

this prior art, it is an object of the present invention to provide an arrangement that ensures an increased level of security for devices that (are) interfaced with a communication network to enable the safe execution of sensitive transactions.” So the reference is clearly relevant to “inventions regarding data transactions between any open platform such as a PC, terminal, laptop or electronic personal assistant that is connected to a network or electronic personal assistant that is connected to a network and open to malicious programs such as viruses and the like” (*Aaro*, column 1 lines 48 – 51). Thus, the method according to *Aaro* does not imply offering any advantage of helping provide security within a microprocessor system for acceleration of data processing operations.

Further, *Aaro* does not constitute analogous prior art to an invention related to processing of data on chip level in a data microprocessor system. Clearly, there is no particular evidence in the references that suggests the combination of these two references. Hence, this is an improper combination of references.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of July 31, 2007, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 20-23 to issue is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Francis J. Maguire/

Registration No. 31,391

Attorney for Applicant

FJM/mo  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, Connecticut 06468  
(203) 261-1234